

E 457
.8
.C433
Copy 2

LINCOLN
THE MAN OF SORROWS



Class E 457

Book 18
C 433

Copyright N^o. copy 7

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.



LINCOLN: THE MAN OF SORROW

By EUGENE W. CHAFIN, LL. B.


OF THE CHICAGO BAR

"The field of history is so vast that the student derives his completest instruction from biographies."

—Cushman K. Davis.

Published by
LINCOLN TEMPERANCE PRESS
92 La Salle Street
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1908

Copy 2



Copyright 1908.

BY EUGENE W. CHAFIN

CONTENTS

LECTURE—"LINCOLN: THE MAN OF SORROW" 7

APPENDIX

LINCOLN'S TEMPERANCE SPEECH	-	-	49
FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS	-	-	69
SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS	-	-	88
EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION	-	-	92
THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS	-	-	96

LINCOLN: THE MAN OF SORROW

A LECTURE BY EUGENE W. CHAFIN,

Delivered in "The Temple Lecture Course," in Ebenezer M. E.
Church, Philadelphia, Pa., February 25, 1907¹

We are pleased to meet such a large and enthusiastic audience tonight. I have not been in Philadelphia since the Centennial was held here in 1876 until today. I am glad to be here again.

Most people are interested in American history. All ought to be. We are becoming students of history more and more every day. The great problem is how to study it. I believe we should burn all the school histories of today. It has become so large a subject that we cannot teach it in the schools through the ordinary school book.

The only way we can truly study history is through biography; by reading the lives of great men. All the important events in his-

¹Reported by Geo. O. Swartz, stenographer, Camden, N. J.; Rev. R. E. Johnson, pastor, presiding; music by the King's Daughters' quartet, of Streator, Ill.

tory surround the lives of great men, and if we would teach the children in the school and in the home early in life to read of the great men of the past, we would not only teach them history, but it would cultivate a liking for it so they would go on in later years studying and becoming familiar with the facts which have made us the great Nation we are.

The only trouble with this method is that we have so little good biography. It is only within twenty or thirty years that we have been getting what we may call fairly good biography.

Washington has been dead more than one hundred years, and many biographies have been written, but a good, first-class life of Washington has not yet been published. I have over one hundred and fifty volumes of Washingtoniana in my library, and can see they are getting better each year. We may expect to get a first-class life of Washington before many years.

If that be true, what shall we say in relation to Abraham Lincoln? He has been dead over forty years, and there has been no good,

true, first-class life of Lincoln yet written, and none of you will live long enough to see such a life published. We cannot get away from our prejudices. We are too close to some of these great characters in history to tell the whole truth about them.

Lincoln is the most difficult character in all history to understand. Tonight I wish to emphasize the *moral* of his life, rather than its history. I intend to take up this one phase of his life and see if we can get a little closer to this great man—the greatest character not only in the history of the United States, but in the history of the world in the nineteenth century. The hardest character to comprehend in all history. That is why no good biography of him has been written. No man has yet seemed to comprehend him.

There is one thing certain if we are going to try to fathom Lincoln we must trace the hand of God in his life, and those who study the life of Abraham Lincoln and see *not* the hand of God in it, study it to no purpose.

I am going to speak of that phase of his life and character entitled "Lincoln, the Man of Sorrow," and am going to liken him in

some respects to the “Man of many Sorrows”—Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. For what our Lord and Saviour is to Divine history Abraham Lincoln is to American history. One was the Saviour of the World, the other a saviour of a Nation and a race.

Lincoln was born in a degradation very far below respectable poverty, in the State of Kentucky,¹ and lived in that poverty the whole of his childhood. When he was in his eighth year the family removed to the State of Indiana; before he was ten years of age his mother died—the first great crushing grief and sorrow of this boy. When he was about nineteen his only sister died under very distressing circumstances. Up to the time he was twenty-one years of age he had seen little of real Christian civilization. No joy or pleasure of childhood had entered into the life of Abraham Lincoln. He had lived in the back woods, not only in a log cabin but in a log hovel, not very much of clothing, only a year’s schooling.

Thomas Lincoln was an ignorant, worth-

¹Abraham Lincoln was born Sunday morning, February 12, 1809, in Hardin (now LaRue) County, Kentucky, three miles from Hodgenville.

less, shiftless, illiterate man, and thought it a waste of time for young Abraham to learn to read and write, as he could do neither—his mother could read but probably not write. There never were any cords of love and sympathy between Thomas Lincoln and Abraham and he treated the boy with great cruelty.¹ When he was grown into manhood, he always wanted to get away from the thought of his childhood. There was no day in this child's life which brought him happiness, and I say to you, my dear friends, no matter what else you do in this world give children happiness. A happy day for a boy or girl means a thousand days, as they live it over and over again as the years go by. Such was not for Abraham Lincoln. He had not a day in his childhood that he wanted to live over again. Undoubtedly that had a great deal to do with his melancholy disposition. He was not the jovial, jolly man that some of you think he was. He was the most melancholy of men. He had the blues most of the time. He was either clear down or clear up. His genius for telling stories was

¹Thomas Lincoln died in Coles County, Illinois, in 1851.

the safety valve that saved his life. It lifted him up, he laughed and made others laugh. His life was either a comedy or a tragedy most of the time.

When he was twenty-one years of age he removed with the family to the State of Illinois and leaving the parental home, went to the village of New Salem in that State, a place of about fifteen log houses.

He lived there about seven years, and soon after he left, the village went out of existence and a new town was started near there called Petersburg. It was in that little log village that Lincoln discovered himself. He went to work as an ordinary laborer, then in a store, and finally bought the store and with his partner ran it a few months and failed, leaving a large debt on his hands which it took him years to pay. While he was living there he made the acquaintance of a beautiful and cultured young lady by the name of Ann Rutledge, and they were engaged to be married. It was his first contact with real Christian civilization. She taught him grammar and to study the Bible and Shakespeare. Two books that all young people should read

every day. Lincoln's familiarity with them had largely to do with his literary style which is a combination of both. His first earthly joy seemed at last to be within his grasp, but a few months before they were to be married she died.¹

While I was in Petersburg near his old home last year on the 12th of February, to deliver this address, I went to the little cemetery on the hill and the sexton pointed out a neglected grave with a little headstone upon which was simply the name Ann Rutledge,² and as I stood there with uncovered head, I said in that grave was buried the heart of Abraham Lincoln. Her death so worked on his mind that his friends feared he would commit suicide. In a few months he went about his work again, but never recovered from that great sorrow.

He was elected to the legislature of Illi-

¹Miss Rutledge died Aug. 25, 1835, of typhoid fever.

²Beautiful Oakland Cemetery is about half a mile from the city of Petersburg, Ill. The headstone is a rough boulder about two feet in diameter taken from the roadside, with the name "Ann Rutledge" rudely chiseled upon a level place. The entire cost probably did not exceed one dollar. It is in marked contrast to the beautiful and expensive monuments to the rich surrounding it. Withal there seems to be a fitness about it for this Lincolnian simplicity suggests.

"The short and simple annals of the poor."

nois, served four terms¹ and distinguished himself for nothing. He went out of the legislature with practically nothing to his credit as a statesman.

The four legislatures of which he was a member gave us the most vicious legislation in the history of the State of Illinois.

While a member of the legislature he removed to Springfield, April 15, 1837, which was in his district, and began the practice of law, having been admitted to the bar in 1836, was fairly successful, and it was the only success he attained anywhere up to the Presidency. Soon after removing to Springfield he made the acquaintance of Miss Mary Todd, whom he afterward married. He courted her for several years, and on the first day appointed for their marriage Mr. Lincoln did not appear, and of course there was no wedding.² Lincoln's conscience

¹He was elected in the years 1834, 1836, 1838 and 1840.

²The day fixed for the marriage was Jan. 1, 1841. Lincoln expresses his feelings to John T. Stuart, then in Washington, in a letter written at Springfield, January 23, 1841, as follows:

"For not giving you a general summary of news, you must pardon me; it is not in my power to do so. I am now the most miserable man living. If what I feel were equally

would not quite allow him to marry her, and he could not face it, and he did not, and ran away from it. About a year and ten months afterwards their friends entered into diplomatic negotiations and got them to speaking together, and one Thursday they agreed to be married and they were married the next day, Friday, Nov. 4, 1842. Now ordinarily the period of courtship and engagement is the happiest period of one's life except that which is followed by happy marriage.

Not so with Lincoln. They were not happy days. His first love was Ann Rutledge and he doubted whether he ought to marry another. The days he courted Miss Todd were among the most unhappy of his life—except after he got her. She was bright, finely educated, could speak French as well

distributed to the whole human family there would not be one cheerful face on the earth. Whether I shall ever be better I cannot tell; I awfully forbode I shall not. To remain as I am is impossible; I must die or be better it appears to me. The matter you speak of on my account you may attend to as you say, unless you shall hear of my condition forbidding it. I say this because I fear I shall be unable to attend to any business here, and a change of scene might help me. If I could be myself I would rather remain at home with Judge Logan. I can write no more."

as English, aristocratic, haughty, her ambition colossal, and wanted to shine in society, and was one of the ugliest women in Illinois. There is only one State in the Nation where you can arrest a woman for being a "common scold." That is New Jersey, and it was a good thing she did not live there. This is not a pleasant thing to speak of in a lecture, and none of his biographers have said much about her. I would not speak of it tonight only that it is necessary for us to know everything about this man. Everything that occurred in his life. We want to see what made him the great character that he was in our history. In order to do that we must know everything that entered into his life. He was President of the United States which made her Mistress of the White House and therefore I have a right to tell the truth about Mrs. Lincoln. To illustrate how they enjoyed married life, he came home one day very tired. He laid himself on the couch, and she started as we say out West, "blazing away" at him. One of the neighbors came in and said to him, "Why don't you jaw back Abe?" He said, "That did Mary a great

deal of good and did me no harm." He was a philosopher. Decided to take her for better or for worse.

His married life was not a congenial one from the beginning to the end. No happiness could come to Lincoln from any source.

They had four children.¹ One died in infancy and one died in the White House when the great Civil War was on the heart of this man and he was brought down almost to the point of being crushed by the death of "Little Willie." It was almost more than he could stand. But you must understand that the death of Ann Rutledge brought him nearer to God. From that time on Lincoln was a student of the Bible. The great crushing blow of the death of "Little Willie" brought him still nearer to God and I do not

¹Robert Todd Lincoln, still living and resides in Chicago, born August 1, 1843.

Edward Baker Lincoln, born March 10, 1846, died in infancy.

William Wallace Lincoln, born Dec. 21, 1850, died in the White House February 20, 1862.

Thomas (Tad) Lincoln, born April 4, 1853, died in Chicago July 15, 1871.

Mrs. Mary Todd Lincoln died Sunday evening, July 16, 1882, at the residence of her sister, Mrs. Ninian W. Edwards, in the house where she had been married November 4, 1842, to Abraham Lincoln.

think any man can say from that period Abraham Lincoln was not a devout Christian.

These crushing blows of great grief in the lives of men sometimes bring out the best there is in them, if they are able to overcome and rise above them as Lincoln was able to do. These sorrows kept him close to the common people. They just seemed to have to come to this man's life to bring out the best there was in him. Thereafter he had a deeper sympathy for the parents who had sons in the army and none appealed to him in vain to save them if it were possible.

In 1846 Lincoln was elected to Congress. All of his campaigns were conducted with great bitterness against him. This one when he ran for Congress was the least bitter of any of them. He ran against Rev. Peter Cartwright, the great preacher. He had been there only a few months before he made a speech against the Mexican War. This caused his defeat for re-nomination. If you have read many lives of Lincoln you have found that there is not a biographer who tells the truth about this matter. Every one says he declined a re-election.

Oh, will the time ever come in this country when the biographers will tell the truth. Let us have the truth about these great men. It is marvelous how people like to stick to some old lie. That George Washington cherry tree and hatchet story will illustrate this point.

I said in my lecture on "Washington as a Statesman," at one of our Chautauquas last summer, that the story about the cherry tree was a pure fabrication.¹ There never was a word of truth in it. After the lecture a Sabbath school teacher came to me and said, "Mr. Chafin I hope you will never tell another American audience that that story was not true. It is such a nice story to tell my Sabbath school class. It has such a good moral to it." Just think of that old lie having a *good moral* to it.

¹The story was not in the first "Life of Washington," written by "M. L. Weems, formerly pastor of Mount Vernon parish," published a few years *before* the death of Washington, Dec. 14, 1799. It first appeared in the fifth edition published in 1806 and was copied bodily from an English gentleman's sketch of his son, which appeared in England in 1799. Weems says it was communicated to him by "an aged lady," who was a distant relative. I think Weems was the most cheerful liar of his time, or, as Henry Fielding, the author of "Tom Jones," one of the first great novels of the world, said of the opposing lawyer, "With him, truth is a virtue which becomes very much fatigued by exercise."

Tell the truth about Lincoln. He could not get the re-nomination. He wanted to stay in Congress and if he had not chosen to stay there Mrs. Lincoln wished to continue to be a Congressman's wife and that would have settled it. His speech against the Mexican War put him out of Congress and ended his political career for the time being. I see the hand of God in it. The Almighty was reserving Lincoln to save this Nation. If he had been re-elected in 1848 he would have been in the Congress that passed the "compromise measures" of 1850, including the Fugitive Slave law. If he had had a career in Congress at that time and taken a part in the Congressional turmoils preceding the war he would never have been President. If he had voted against the Fugitive Slave law, he would never have been nominated, and if he had voted for it he would not have been elected.

Does not the truth fit him better than the untruth? The artist who takes a line out of his rugged face, or the author who takes a true line out of his history is an enemy of truth.

Does it not appear that Almighty God was saving this man for a great work? He then returned to Springfield and settled down to the practice of law, the deadliest politician in Illinois. There was great grief in the Lincoln home. Mrs. Lincoln had to leave Washington society. It undoubtedly furnished an occasion when he would rather have heard her speak French than English. He then determined to withdraw permanently from politics and make a good lawyer of himself. For the first time in his life he settled down to the serious study of books. It was his habit to read *men* more than *books*. He embraced this opportunity as he could not have done if he had stayed in Congress, and became a good lawyer.

The repeal of the Missouri Compromise, on May 30, 1854, aroused his indignation and brought him again into the political arena. He saw in it the dangers which precipitated secession. On October 16 he made one of the five¹ great speeches which formu-

¹The five great speeches were those delivered at Springfield, Ill., Feb. 22, 1842; Peoria, Ill., Oct. 16, 1854; Springfield, Ill., June 16, 1858; Columbus, O., Sept. 16, 1859, and Cooper Institute, N. Y. City, Feb. 27, 1860.

lated his political creed (in reply to Senator Douglas) on the Kansas-Nebraska law, which repealed the Missouri Compromise.

He became a candidate for the legislature and was elected in November, 1854. The returns showed a majority in the legislature opposed to the re-election of Senator Shields and in favor of the principles Lincoln had advocated during the campaign. He at once became a candidate for the United States Senate and resigned his seat in the legislature. When the balloting took place on Feb. 8, 1855, Lincoln had forty-seven votes and Lyman Trumbull five. Four members were controlled by State Senator John M. Palmer and would not vote for Lincoln, and it took fifty-one to elect. On the eleventh ballot Lincoln had his name withdrawn and Judge Trumbull was elected. His defeat was Providential. Had he gone to the Senate and been prominent in all the questions that led up to the secession he would not have been nominated for President. God was saving him for the great work of preserving this Nation. He again went back to his law office and Mrs. Lincoln spent the coming years in

Springfield instead of Washington society.

In 1858 Lincoln was again nominated for the Senate and the seven great joint debates¹ took place between him and Douglas, but when it was all over, Lincoln was again Providentially defeated. He had to go back to Springfield and practice law. Grief again in the Lincoln home. Oh, if she could only have been a Senator's wife!

The next year he attempted lyceum lecturing on the subject "Discoveries, Inventions and Improvements," which proved a dismal failure.

A few months ago I visited Lincoln's old home in Springfield, a modest little frame house which perhaps cost \$3,000.00, the only real estate that Lincoln ever owned. It is now owned by the State of Illinois, and while there was shown by the attendant the sofa upon which Miss Mary Todd entertained both Douglas and Lincoln while courting her

¹The debates took place as follows:
Ottawa, Ill., August 21, 1858.
Freeport, Ill., August 27, 1858.
Jonesboro, Ill., Sept. 15, 1858.
Charleston, Ill., Sept. 18, 1858.
Galesburg, Ill., Oct. 7, 1858.
Quincy, Ill., Oct. 13, 1858.
Alton, Ill., Oct. 15, 1858.

in her sister's home. That was the first time Stephen A. Douglas got the better of Lincoln —when he didn't get her.

During the debate Lincoln said if Douglas won the Senatorship he would never be President of the United States. He might well have said that if Lincoln is beaten for the Senatorship then he will have a chance for the Presidency. If Lincoln had been elected Senator in 1858 he would never have been President. No man has yet gone from the Senate Chamber to the White House. Senators Seward, Cameron, and Chase tried it in 1860, and many other Senators at different periods.

Lincoln was a man who always arose to the greatness of the occasion. That is the sign of greatness, and there have been but few *great* men in the world's history and *very few* in American history. We think of Presidents and Cabinet officers and Governors and Senators and Congressmen as big men. They are big on small occasions, but usually *small on great* occasions. There are only a few great men on *great* occasions and Lincoln was one of them. Lincoln had been

talked of for the Presidency. He was invited to deliver an address in New York City at Cooper Institute on February 27, 1860.¹ All

¹Of this speech Joseph H. Choate said:

"It is now forty years since I first saw and heard Abraham Lincoln, but the impression he left on my mind is ineffaceable. After his great successes in the West he came to New York to make a political address. He appeared in every sense of the word like one of the plain people among whom he loved to be counted. At first sight there was nothing impressive or imposing about him, except that his great stature singled him out from the crowd; his clothes hung awkwardly on his giant frame; his face was of a dark pallor, without the slightest tinge of color; his seamed and rugged features bore the furrows of hardship and struggle; his deep-set eyes looked sad and anxious; his countenance in repose gave little evidence of that brain power which had raised him from the lowest to the highest station among his countrymen. As he talked to me before the meeting he seemed ill at ease, with that sort of apprehension which a young man might feel before presenting himself to a new and strange audience whose critical disposition be dreaded.

"It was a great audience, including all the noted men—all the learned and cultured of his party in New York, editors, clergymen, statesmen, lawyers, merchants, critics. They were all very curious to hear him. His fame as a powerful speaker had preceded him, and exaggerated rumor of his wit had reached the East. When Mr. Bryant presented him on the high platform of the Cooper Institute a vast sea of eager, upturned faces greeted him, full of intense curiosity to see what this rude child of the people was like. He was equal to the occasion. When he spoke he was transformed; his eyes kindled, his voice rang, his face shone and seemed to light up the whole assembly. For an hour and a half he held his audience in the hollow of his hand. His style of speech and manner of delivery were severely simple. What Lowell called "The Great Simplicities of The Bible" with which he was so familiar, were reflected in his discourse. With no attempt at ornament or rhetoric, without parade or pretense, he spoke straight to the point. If any came expecting the turgid eloquence or the ribaldry of the frontier they must have been startled at the earnest and sincere purity of his

political New York turned out to hear him. They said let us go and we will have a good chance to laugh, and we shall enjoy it. William Cullen Bryant introduced him, and Abraham Lincoln stepped forward and delivered an address an hour and a half in length. No one smiled. He knew that to go to New York and make a speech that

utterances. It was marvelous to see how this untutored man, by mere self discipline and the chastening of his own spirit, had outgrown all meretricious arts, and found his way to the grandeur and strength of absolute simplicity.

"He spoke upon the theme which he had mastered so thoroughly. He demonstrated by copious historical proofs and masterly logic that the fathers who created the Constitution in order to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, and to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity, intended to empower the Federal Government to exclude slavery from the territories. In the kindest spirit he protested against the avowed threat of the southern states to destroy the Union if, in order to secure freedom in those vast regions, out of which future states were to be carved, a Republican President were elected. He closed with an appeal to his audience, spoken with all the fire of his aroused and kindling conscience, with a full outpouring of his love of justice and liberty, to maintain their political purpose on that lofty and unassailable issue of right and wrong which alone could justify it and not to be intimidated from their high resolve and sacred duty by any threats of destruction to the government or of ruin to themselves. He concluded with this telling sentence, which drove the whole argument home to all our hearts:

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty, as we understand it."

"That night the great hall, and the next day the whole city, rang with delighted applause and congratulations, and he who had come as a stranger departed with the laurels of a great triumph."

would make everybody laugh would not stamp him as a man big enough for the Presidency of the United States. Instead he interpreted the conception of the founders of the National Government, on the slavery question, in the light of the constitution, as no other man had in all our history. It was the greatest constitutional argument against the position of the South since Webster's reply to Hayne, and was not second to it.¹ He arose to the greatness of the occasion. That speech ought to have prevented the Civil War. It would have prevented secession, had not the South appealed from reason and logic to the sword. From that day Abraham Lincoln was an available candidate for the Presidency. I wish you would all read that speech, as his character is stamped on every page of it, and especially the last sentence, and every American ought to have it indelibly impressed on his memory, and act on it on all civic occasions. He closed that great speech with these words: "*Let us have faith,*

¹Daniel Webster, Senator from Massachusetts, made his famous reply to Senator Robert Y. Hayne of South Carolina in the U. S. Senate Jan. 26, 1830, on the question of State Sovereignty.

that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it.” Oh, if all Americans would act upon that, we would have better civil government than we now have.

We have now traced the career of Lincoln up to 1860. What is there about his record that should have made him the proper candidate for the Presidency? He could not successfully run a grocery store in a village composed of one hundred inhabitants. He had been a failure in the legislature. He had been a failure in Congress from any worldly standpoint. He had failed twice to be elected United States Senator. He had made a failure of lyceum lecturing. He had been a successful lawyer as many other men had. Why was it that the Nation turned toward him as the man to be President of the United States in one of the most trying times in the history of our country. When had he ever shown executive ability? He had never been president of a village, mayor of a city or governor of a state. Why should he have been chosen? My answer to that is, because of his *great character*. The people believed in

him. They had faith in his honesty. He was called "Honest Old Abe." It was in a period of great moral awakening; and they were looking for a man to represent a great moral question. All people had faith in his integrity¹ and character. That was one thing that stood before the American people above everything else, and I think the day and hour has come when we should teach this generation of people that that was the one great reason why this man with his limited experience and with the surrounding circumstances of his life was selected to be the President of the United States. What gave him this character? I shall attribute the foundation of it to the fact that from his youth he chose between right and wrong and was a total abstainer from intoxicating liquor, from tobacco, from profanity and he never gambled; the four great vices that were so common with the people among whom he mingled. And because he chose between right and wrong regardless of his associates, and kept away from these vices, he built a *character* that made him the man for the Presidency in the minds of the people. There

has not been a biographer, not a single one, who has written a page on that part of his life, and Nicolay and Hay, who wrote his life in ten volumes, which should have been the standard life of Lincoln for all time,¹ did not find room to refer to these things. Lincoln, on the 22nd day of February, 1842, made one of the greatest temperance speeches that has ever been made in this country.² He asked people to sign the pledge in the "Washingtonian Movement" and was a member of the Sons of Temperance. In 1855 he spent five or six weeks advocating the adoption of a prohibition law then submitted to a vote of the people in Illinois. It is said they left these facts out because they thought it would hurt the sale of the book. Oh! the time will soon come when the American people will not be ashamed to say that Abraham

¹No two men in the United States knew Lincoln better than John Hay and John G. Nicolay, who were his private secretaries, but it is a singular fact that no man ever writes a good true biography of an intimate friend or companion or even contemporary. He is more apt to see the small things in his life than the large ones. Coming ages are looking for the big things he did which have had an effect on civilization. He sees in every line how it is likely to affect the family or associates of his subject and himself in their good opinion. It is easier to tell the whole truth when they are dead.

²See Appendix.

Lincoln never used alcohol or tobacco, or profanity, or engaged in gambling.

I would put in the biographies of this great man and teach this generation that the most valuable asset in any position of life is *character*. There was no other reason for the nomination of Abraham Lincoln for the Presidency. The convention met, Lincoln was nominated and elected. Ordinarily the four months between election and inauguration is a period of great happiness for a President-elect. The whole world is applauding him, politicians and statesmen of all parties praising him; a time of great joy. Not so with Lincoln. Nothing but grief and sorrow. The official vote had hardly been declared before the news came that South Carolina had seceded and other States followed. What did it mean? That Lincoln had to sit there at Springfield for four long months with his hands tied, could neither speak nor act and see the Nation being torn to pieces, leaving to him the task of mending it.

He went to the Presidency with less political party support than any man who was

ever President. His own party trembled for him. They said this untried man who has never shown any executive ability we have elected President of the United States, and he is the man who is to solve the mightiest problems in our history. They doubted him; they said he was probably a weak man; that in the Presidency he might let the Nation be destroyed.

When inauguration day came on the Fourth of March, 1861, and Lincoln stepped to the East portico of the Capitol to deliver his inaugural address,¹ he then had it in his power to destroy this Nation in a fifteen minutes speech, but he *did not*. He arose to the greatness of the occasion. He was a Nationalist. He had learned the principles of Nationalism from George Washington and John Marshall; and where *they* left the cords of Nationalism they were gathered up by Lincoln and woven into his inaugural address, and he never lost sight of them until they became the accepted law of the land at Appomattox.

After he had delivered it, stating sub-

¹See Appendix.

stantially that we were a Nation, and his oath of office would make him preserve it to the very last, the country breathed easier. He had said in words what the Nation felt but could not express. All the principal men of the Nation saw that he was the man. He arose to the greatness and dignity of the occasion in that inaugural address, the greatest in history, for in it he laid the foundation to save the Nation.

He had more trouble with his Cabinet than all other Presidents combined. Instead of being loyal to him, laying aside their political ambitions in this hour of the Nation's greatest trials, they began quarreling among themselves and plotting to succeed him as President. Oh! I tell you, my dear friends, that when the true history of this Nation is written, there will be some of them who will appear mighty small and certainly unpatriotic. Secretary of State Seward was sure he knew more than the President. Inside of ninety days he got off his high horse; Lincoln leaned over and took hold of the gentleman's collar, and carefully put him on behind and continued to handle the reins

himself. Seward accepted the situation and thereafter made a good Secretary of State. He had political sense enough to know that if Lincoln's administration were a success, he must be his own successor, and if it failed no one of his party could be elected.

Then he had trouble with Chase, Secretary of the Treasury, who had the Presidential microbe working in his head. A very bad case of it and he never got over it, even after he got to be Chief Justice. He spent his days and nights studying how he could beat Lincoln and be President himself. But he was so good a Secretary of the Treasury that Lincoln was broad enough and great enough to overlook his Presidential fever and kept him at his post. Nearly all of them were making him trouble instead of helping him; some one said to him, "Why don't you send all those fellows home?" "What," said Lincoln, "Send Seward back to New York, Chase to Ohio, Cameron to Pennsylvania, and Montgomery Blair to Maryland! Why I can watch them a great deal easier around this Cabinet table than I could if they were at home." He was not only a statesman,

but a philosopher and diplomat. He was a man of great tact, which is the gentle art of doing things the best way.

Matters got so bad in the war department that he had to get rid of Secretary Cameron. But he did not send him back to Pennsylvania. He sent him as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Russia. Then he appointed Edwin M. Stanton, the greatest Secretary of War this Nation ever had. A man of iron, with nerves of steel, and there he firmly held the power of Secretary of War with Lincoln's guiding hand to save the Nation. But he was the trial of Lincoln's life. Oh! the patience required to bear with him. He was the Mars of this world—Lincoln was the Venus of earth. One day he sent an order to Stanton to pardon some one, and Stanton tore it up and threw it in the waste basket. The gentleman returned and told Lincoln that Stanton said he was a fool. Lincoln replied, "If Stanton said so it must be so." A few hours later he repeated the order *and it was obeyed.* When Lincoln was a boy he used to plow and when he came to a nice apple

tree, which some day would bear fruit, he plowed around it, and that is the way he did with Stanton, "plowed around him," because he knew he was a great Secretary of War. Oh, the patience he had. The patience to stand him those three long years of war. No one could ever have stood Stanton three years who had not been taught patience by living with Mrs. Lincoln twenty years. So you see there is a compensation for all trials. These things all entered into the life of the man who had this mighty task on his hands of saving this Nation. But it just seems as though nothing ever came to him to make life easy and happy as it does to ordinary mortals.

Then he had trouble with his generals, especially McClellan and Fremont. They had not their shoulder straps on twenty-four hours before they began making arrangements to be President next time. Others followed in order. Give them a little promotion and they got "the big head." Lilliputian politicians, about 4 by 4 inches square, and they could never see anything bigger than themselves.

Be it said to the everlasting credit of the Federal army that Lincoln finally found three generals who did not want to be President, who knew how and were willing to fight, and who were never jealous of each other or any one else. Place high on the roll of true patriotism the names of Generals Grant, Sherman and Sheridan.

And he had trouble with Congress of course. Oh! if we could only carry on war without a Congress, with its resolutions and speeches. A debating society never won a battle. When the cabinet was all right, the "big head" generals dismissed, Congress not in session, and Mrs. Lincoln asleep, then Horace Greeley always said some fool thing in the New York Tribune. The war went on and he arose above these things and carried burdens that others should have borne with the one great thought of saving the Nation.

We now come to the emancipation proclamation. I presume if I were to ask an ordinary American audience what was the greatest act of Lincoln's life, the reply would be, "Signing the emancipation proclamation." "*With one great stroke of his pen he*

struck the shackles from four million slaves.” I actually read that the other day in one of our great daily papers. Why do people say that? There is not a word of truth in it—it did not free a single slave—either the preliminary proclamation of Sept. 22, 1862, or the final one of January 1, 1863. You must remember that the proclamation only provided that the slaves within the Confederate lines should be free, leaving the ones within the Federal lines to remain in slavery. All the slaves in Missouri, Maryland, Kentucky, Delaware, West Virginia, Tennessee, and, parts of Virginia and Louisiana were not included in the proclamation. It tried to free only the slaves over which the Nation then had no control, and left in slavery all those over which it had physical control.¹

What happened? Enlistments fell off, desertions increased in the army; officers resigned their commissions; it divided the North and solidified the South; stocks went down, and when the elections came in the fall of 1862 the administration lost thirty-

¹The Fugitive Slave law was not repealed until June 28, 1864. The 13th Amendment which took effect Dec. 18, 1865, freed the slaves.

eight seats in the House of Representatives and lost heavily in the states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana. Lincoln lost his own State, which sent to the Senate a man who fought his administration; and the legislature contained so many rebels that Governor Yates pro-rogued them and sent them home,—the only like instance in American history. The effect of the proclamation on foreign countries fell far short of the expectations of the administration. Are we not far enough from the war now to tell the truth about this matter? I think it was the greatest mistake of his administration. It was at least of doubtful utility.¹

That was not his greatest act. What then *was* his greatest act? When the flag was shot down at Fort Sumter he had to decide whether or not the constitution gave him power to "coerce a sovereign State." Nearly all the best constitutional lawyers of the country decided that he had no such power. Lincoln again arose to the greatness of the occasion and decided that this Nation had in-

¹See Appendix.

herent power to save its own life. No greater or better interpretation of the Constitution was ever made by Chief Justice Marshall. The decision was equivalent to an amendment to the Constitution. No one disputes its correctness *now*. It took a Lincoln to see it *then*. To decide that he had such power meant that we were a "Nation of people," and not a "Union of States." We would have been destroyed as a Nation in an hour had he decided otherwise. He then issued his call for 75,000 men and they came. When others were called they came, and our National unity was preserved.

In my opinion this was the greatest act of his life.

Signing the emancipation proclamation sinks into insignificance compared to it.

If we could destroy the larger part of all that has ever been said about Lincoln and start with one good, true life of him, I should have hopes that some time in the near future we might begin to comprehend this most incomprehensible man.

He was invited to make a few dedicatory remarks on the occasion of the dedication of

a portion of the battlefield of Gettysburg as a National Cemetery November 19, 1863. Edward Everett was to deliver the main address, which took over two hours, and was a magnificent effort. There were 100,000 people present.

It was a great occasion and Lincoln did not fail to be *as great as the occasion*. After Mr. Everett's oration, he stepped forward and read from a sheet of paper ten sentences, 268 words. The Gettysburg address.¹ The only bit of American literature ever taught in an English University. The battle of Gettysburg was the decisive battle of the Civil War, and one of the greatest in all history. Lincoln wanted to ask his people not to let the men who fell there "die in vain." If he made a long speech they would not read it, so he made it short enough for them to commit to memory. Those words so touched the Northern heart and quickened it to action, for the remaining conflict, that their importance became second only to the battle of Gettysburg itself. Everett's speech did not live an hour. Lincoln's will live for-

¹See Appendix.

ever. Of this speech Senator Charles Sumner said: "Since Simonides wrote the epitaph of those who died at Thermopylae, nothing equal has ever been breathed over the fallen dead."

Incomprehensible Lincoln! No one ever called him a scholar. He was never noted for being a man of great learning. Up to this time no University had proposed to confer upon him the degree of Doctor of Laws.¹ Yet we find him writing such masterpieces of English as the Gettysburg address, the two Inaugural addresses,² the Cooper Institute speech and many others. His letters are such masterpieces of logic, reason and good English that they are not second to Bacon's Essays. Some of his sentences are like a demonstration in Euclid. Here is one. After the fall of Vicksburg and the North had gained control of the Mississippi river, he summed up the situation in one sentence of ten words thus: "The Father of Waters

¹In December, 1864, the degree of LL.D. was conferred upon President Lincoln *in absentia* by the Trustees of the College of New Jersey, now Princeton University. His letter of acceptance was dated Washington, Dec. 27, 1864. He never got to Princeton in person to receive the degree formally.

²See appendix.

again goes unvexed to the Sea." In all of Shakespeare you can hardly find a more comprehensive sentence.

I think Lincoln wrote the best English of any man since Shakespeare, and it is as hard for us to conceive that the Lincoln of New Salem was the Lincoln of Gettysburg, as it is to believe that the Shakespeare of Stratford is the Shakespeare of the plays.

In the presidential campaign of 1864, when Lincoln stood for re-election, there took place the bitterest campaign in our history. He had three formidable foes to combat, the secessionist in the field in the South, the Democratic party of the North, and worse than both the former were the traitors, brainy, ambitious, dishonest, unpatriotic politicians who wanted office and promotion worse than they wanted to save the Nation, who were prominent members of his own party. They not only fought him until he was re-nominated, but demanded his declination thereafter.

He was so villified and maligned by men who ought to have been his supporters, that for him personally it took all the honor and pleasure out of his re-election.

Nothing could come to him as to other men to give him pleasure and happiness. It seems as though that was not to be. During it all no bitter word of resentment was ever spoken by him.

Lincoln will live in the love and admiration of the people of this Nation when his maligners shall have become the unremembered mold of mediocrity and malice,—the forgotten dust of defeat.

Let us mark the contrast between the lives of our two greatest Americans.

Washington was born of a race of cavaliers, and was the greatest of them all.

Lincoln was born a plebeian and was the poorest of ten thousand.

Washington's boyhood days were filled with joy and prosperity, and at nineteen he was one of the Adjutants-General of Virginia, with the rank of Major.

Lincoln's childhood was filled with sorrow, and at twenty-one, uneducated, unknown, and not cared for, he was driving two yoke of oxen hitched to an emigrant wagon, going from Indiana to Illinois.

Washington enjoyed more than forty

years of domestic felicity, never excelled in the lives of great men.

Lincoln's married life of twenty-two years we will not dwell upon.

Washington was a success as a planter, financier, legislator, general, statesman and President. All things transpired in such a manner as to give him honor and pleasure out of public service.

Lincoln's only *great success* came to him through the Presidency. The attaining and administration of the office gave him little personal happiness.

Washington, after a career of unprecedented success in war and peace retired to his beautiful Mt. Vernon home with his kindred and friends around him. No great sorrow had ever entered his life. In ripe old age, in that peaceful home, with his beloved Martha by his side he laid down to rest—"and he was not."

Lincoln, who had always worn "sorrow's crown of sorrow" came to his death while yet bearing the burden, in a public place with the enactment of the greatest tragedy since the crucifixion.¹

¹President Lincoln was assassinated by John Wilkes Booth

In some respects they were alike. They were both *great men*. No opportunity was ever too great for them to grasp.

Each stood for a great moral and political reform.

No man lives in history and the hearts of the people who does not stand for the foremost moral reform of his day.

We Americans have a right to feel a little proud of the fact that this marvelous young Republic produced the greatest man in the World's history of the 18th century in the person of George Washington; and the greatest of the 19th in the person of Abraham Lincoln.

Our limit is not yet. We shall furnish the greatest man of the 20th century. We are looking for him now. He will be the Statesman who is big enough to rise to the greatness of *opportunity* and lead this Nation to the Prohibition of the liquor traffic. His name in history will be written by the side of Washington and Lincoln.

at Ford's Theater, Washington, D. C., on the evening of April 14, 1865, a few minutes past 10 o'clock. He was carried to a house across the street, remaining unconscious until he died at 7:22 o'clock on the morning of the 15th.

He was buried at Oak Ridge Cemetery, Springfield, Ill., May 4.

In no respect did the life of Lincoln more resemble that of our Saviour than in his last days.

Passion Week means human triumphs—death in agony. Palm Sunday is the Sunday of victory. Good Friday, the day of crucifixion and assassination.

Earthly success and triumph came to the Lord Jesus Christ but once, and that was marked by his triumphal entry into Jerusalem late in the afternoon of Sunday, April 2, A. D. 30. As the multitude escorted Him into the Holy City, they strewed palms in his pathway, and it has been called Palm Sunday to this day.

This earthly triumph of "Jesus Christ, the Man of many Sorrows," took different forms from day to day until April 7, Good Friday, when his enemies again took possession of the City, and He died on the Cross.

Abraham Lincoln's life would have been a failure if secession had triumphed and the states been dissevered.

Success came to him but once also, and was marked by the victory of the Federal Army at Appomattox when General Lee

surrendered to General Grant, on April 9, A. D. 1865, which was also Palm Sunday. Late in the afternoon the news reached Washington. The war was over. The burden was lifted. The Nation was *not dis-severed*, and President Lincoln's name and fame were secure forever. This triumph of "Lincoln, the Man of Sorrow" took different forms from day to day, and made up a large part of the happiness of a life time, until April 14, which was also Good Friday, when, for the first time in history the "Commander-in-Chief" of a victorious army was pierced by a bullet, such as had caused the death of so many thousands of his brave soldiers on the field of battle.

He could not have wished to have died at the hands of an assassin in any other manner.

Triumphant success came into their earthly lives but once, and that was on Palm Sunday. Five days thereafter and on Good Friday, Jesus was crucified.

Five days therafter and on Good Friday, Lincoln was assassinated, and the parallel is complete.

Appendix.

AN ADDRESS

Delivered before the Springfield Washington Temperance Society,
on the 22nd of February, 1842,
By ABRAHAM LINCOLN, Esq.,
And published by direction of the Society.

Although the Temperance cause has been in progress for near twenty years, it is apparent to all, that it is *just now* being crowned with a degree of success, hitherto unparalleled.

The list of its friends is daily swelled by the additions of fifties, of hundreds, and of thousands. The cause itself seems suddenly transformed from a cold, abstract theory, to a living, breathing, active and powerful chieftain, going forth "conquering and to conquer." The citadels of his great adversary are daily being stormed and dismantled; his temples and his altars, where the rites of his idolatrous worship have long been performed, and where human sacrifices have long been wont to be made, are daily desecrated and deserted. The trump

of the conqueror's fame is sounding from hill to hill, from sea to sea, and from land to land, and calling millions to his standard at a blast.

For this new and splendid success, we heartily rejoice. That that success is so much greater *now*, than *heretofore*, is doubtless owing to rational causes; and if we would have it continue, we shall do well to inquire what those causes are. The warfare heretofore waged against the demon Intemperance, has, somehow or other, been erroneous. Either the champions engaged, or the tactics they adopted, have not been the most proper. These champions for the most part, have been Preachers, Lawyers, and hired agents. Between these and the mass of mankind, there is a want of *approachability*, if the term be admissible, partially at least, fatal to their success. They are supposed to have no sympathy of feeling or interest, with those very persons whom it is their object to convince and persuade.

And again, it is so easy and so common to ascribe motives to men of these classes other than those they profess to act upon. The *preacher*, it is said, advocates temper-

ance because he is a fanatic, and desires a union of the Church and State; the *lawyer*, from his pride and vanity of hearing himself speak; and the *hired agent* for his salary. But when one, who has long been known as a victim of intemperance, bursts the fetters that have bound him, and appears before his neighbors "clothed and in his right mind," a redeemed specimen of long lost humanity, and stands up with tears of joy trembling in eyes, to tell of the miseries *once* endured, *now* to be endured no more forever; of his once naked and starving children, now clad and fed comfortably; of a wife, long weighed down with woe, weeping, and a broken heart, now restored to health, happiness, and a renewed affection; and how easily it is all done, once it is resolved to be done; however simple his language, there is a logic and an eloquence in it that few with human feelings, can resist. They cannot say that *he* desires a union of church and state, for he is not a church member; they cannot say *he* is vain of hearing himself speak, for his whole demeanor shows he would gladly avoid speaking at all; they cannot say *he*

speaks for pay, for he receives none, and asks for none. Nor can his sincerity in any way be doubted; or his sympathy for those he would persuade to imitate his example, be denied.

In my judgment, it is to the battles of this new class of champions that our late success is greatly, perhaps chiefly, owing. But, had the old-school champions themselves been of the most wise selecting, was their *system* of tactics, the most judicious? It seems to me, it was not. Too much denunciation against dram-sellers and dram-drinkers was indulged in. This, I think, was both *impolitic* and unjust. It was *impolitic*, because it is not much in the nature of man to be driven to anything; still less to be driven about that which is exclusively his own business; and least of all, where such driving is to be submitted to, at the expense of pecuniary interest, or burning appetite. When the dram-seller and drinker, were incessantly told, not in the accents of entreaty and persuasion, diffidently addressed by erring man to an erring brother; but in the thundering tones of anathema and denunciation, with

which the lordly judge often groups together all the crimes of the felon's life, and thrusts them in his face just ere he passes sentence of death upon him, that *they* were the authors of all the vice and misery and crime in the land; that *they* were the manufacturers and material of all the thieves and robbers and murderers that infest the earth; that *their* houses were the workshops of the devil; and that *their persons* should be shunned by all the good and virtuous as moral pestilences.—I say, when they were told all this, and in this way, it is not wonderful that they were slow, *very slow*, to acknowledge the truth of such denunciations, and to join the ranks of their denouncers, in a hue and cry against themselves.

To have expected them to do otherwise than they did—to have expected them not to meet denunciation with denunciation, crimination with crimination, and anathema with anathema—was to expect a reversal of human nature, which is God's decree and can never be reversed. When the conduct of men is designed to be influenced, *persuasion*, kind, unassuming persuasion, should ever be

adopted. It is an old and a true maxim, "that a drop of honey catches more flies than a gallon of gall."—So with men. If you would win a man to your cause, *first* convince him that you are his sincere friend. Therein is a drop of honey that catches his heart, which, say what he will, is the great high road to his reason, and which, when once gained, you will find but little trouble in convincing his judgment of the justice of your cause, if indeed that cause really be a just one. On the contrary, assume to dictate to his judgment, or to command his action, or to mark him as one to be shunned and despised, and he will retreat within himself, close all the avenues to his head and his heart; and though your cause be naked truth itself, transformed to the heaviest lance, harder than steel, and sharper than steel can be made, and though you throw it with more than Herculean force and precision, you shall be no more able to pierce him than to penetrate the hard shell of a tortoise with a rye straw.

Such is man, *and so must he be understood* by those who lead him, even to his own best interest.

On this point, the Washingtonians greatly excel the temperance advocates of former times. Those whom *they* desire to convince and persuade, are their old friends and companions. They know they are not demons, nor even the worst of men. *They* know that generally they are kind, generous and charitable, even beyond the example of their more staid and sober neighbors. *They* are practical philanthropists; and *they* glow with a generous and brotherly zeal, that mere theorizers are incapable of feeling. Benevolence and charity possess *their* hearts entirely; and out of the abundance of their hearts, their tongues give utterance, "Love through all their actions run, and all their words are mild." In this spirit they speak and act, and in the same, they are heard and regarded. And when such is the temper of the advocate, and such of the audience, no good cause can be unsuccessful. But I have said that denunciations against dram-sellers and dram-drinkers are *unjust* as well as impolitic. Let us see.

I have not enquired at what period of time the use of intoxicating liquors com-

menced, nor is it important to know. It is sufficient that to all of us who now inhabit the world, the practice of drinking them, is just as old as the world itself,—that is, we have seen the one, just as long as we have seen the other. When all such of us as, have now reached the years of maturity, first opened our eyes upon the stage of existence, we found intoxicating liquor, recognized by everybody, used by everybody, and repudiated by nobody. It commonly entered into the first draught of the infant, and the last draught of the dying man. From the side-board of the parson down to the ragged pocket of the houseless loafer, it was constantly found. Physicians prescribed it in this, that, and the other disease. Government provided it for its soldiers and sailors; and to have a rolling or raising, a husking or hoe-down anywhere without it, was *positively unsufferable*.

So, too, it was everywhere a respectable article of manufacture and of merchandise. The making of it was regarded as an honorable livelihood, and he who could make most was the most enterprising and respect-

able. Large and small manufactories of it were everywhere erected, in which all the earthly goods of their owners were invested. Wagons drew it from town to town; boats bore it from clime to clime, and the winds wafted it from nation to nation; and merchants bought and sold it, by wholesale and by retail, with precisely the same feelings, on the part of the seller, buyer, and bystander, as are felt at the selling and buying of flour, beef, bacon, or any other of the real necessities of life. Universal public opinion not only tolerated, but recognized and adopted its use.

It is true that even *then* it was known and acknowledged that many were greatly injured by it; but none seemed to think the injury arose from the *use* of a *bad thing*, but from the *abuse* of a *very good thing*. The victims to it were pitied, and compassionated just as now are the heirs of consumption, and other hereditary diseases. Their failing was treated as a *misfortune*, and not as a *crime*, or even as a *disgrace*.

If, then, what I have been saying be true, is it wonderful, that *some* should think and

act *now*, as *all* thought and acted *twenty years ago*? And is it *just* to assail, condemn, or despise them for doing so? The universal *sense* of mankind, on any subject, is an argument, or at least an *influence* not easily overcome. The success of the argument in favor of the existence of an overruling Providence, mainly depends upon that sense; and men ought not, in justice, to be denounced for yielding to it, in any case, or for giving it up slowly, *especially*, where they are backed by interest, fixed habits, or burning appetites.

Another error, as it seems to me, into which the old reformers fell was the position that all habitual drunkards were utterly incorrigible, and therefore, must be turned adrift, and damned without remedy, in order that the grace of temperance might abound, to the temperate *then*, and to all mankind some hundred years *thereafter*. There is in this something so repugnant to humanity, so uncharitable, so cold blooded and feelingless, that it never did, nor ever can enlist the enthusiasm of a popular cause. We could not love the man who taught it—we could not hear him with patience. The heart could

not throw open its portals to it. The generous man could not adopt it. It could not mix with his blood. It looked so fiendishly selfish, so like throwing fathers and brothers overboard, to lighten the boat for our security—that the noble minded shrank from the manifest meanness of the thing. And besides this, the benefits of a reformation to be effected by such a system were too remote in point of time, to warmly engage many in its behalf. Few can be induced to labor exclusively for posterity; and none will do it enthusiastically. Posterity has done nothing for us; and theorize on it as we may, practically we shall do very little for it, unless we are made to think we are, at the same time, doing something for ourselves. What an ignorance of human nature does it exhibit, to ask or expect a whole community to rise up and labor for the *temporal* happiness of *others* after *themselves* shall be consigned to the dust, a majority of which community take no pains whatever to secure their own eternal welfare, at a no greater distant day? Great distance, in either time or space, has wonderful power to lull and render quiescent

the human mind. Pleasures to be enjoyed, or pains to be endured, *after* we shall be dead and gone, are but little regarded, even in our *own* cases, and much less in the cases of others.

Still, in addition to this, there is something so ludicrous in *promises* of good, or *threats* of evil, a great way off, as to render the whole subject with which they are connected, easily turned into ridicule. "Better lay down that spade you're stealing, Paddy—if you don't you'll pay for it at the day of judgment." "Be the powers, if ye'll credit me so long I'll take another jist."

By the Washingtonians, this system of consigning the habitual drunkard to hopeless ruin is repudiated. *They* adopt a more enlarged philanthropy. They go for present as well as for future good. *They* labor for all *now* living as well as *hereafter* to live. *They* teach *hope* to all—*despair* to none. As applying to *their* cause, *they* deny the doctrine of unpardonable sin. As in Christianity it is taught, so in this *they* teach, that

"While the lamp holds out to burn
The vilest sinner may return."

And, what is matter of the most profound gratulation, they, by experiment upon experiment, and example upon example, prove the maxim to be no less true in the one case than in the other. On every hand we behold those who, but yesterday, were the chief of sinners, now the chief apostles of the cause. Drunken devils are cast out by ones, by sevens, and by legions; and their unfortunate victims, like the poor possessed, who was redeemed from his long and lonely wanderings in the tombs, are publishing to the ends of the earth, how great things have been done for them.

To these *new champions*, and this *new* system of tactics, our late success is mainly owing; and to *them* we must chiefly look for the final consummation. The ball is now rolling gloriously on, and none are so able as *they* to increase its speed, and its bulk,—to add to its momentum, and its magnitude. Even though unlearned in letters, for this task, none others are so well educated. To fit them for this work, they have been taught in the true school. *They* have been in *that* gulf from which they would teach others the means of escape. *They* have passed that

prison wall, which others have long declared impassable; and who that has not, shall dare to weigh opinions with *them* as to the mode of passing.

But if it be true, as I have insisted, that those who have suffered by intemperance *personally*, and have reformed are the most powerful and efficient instruments to push the reformation to ultimate success, it does not follow, that those who have not suffered, have no part left them to perform. Whether or not the world would be vastly benefited by a total and final banishment from it of all intoxicating drinks, seems to me not *now* to be an open question. Three-fourths of mankind confess the affirmative with their *tongues*, and, I believe, all the rest acknowledge it in their *hearts*.

Ought *any* then, to refuse their aid in doing what the good of the *whole* demands? Shall he, who cannot do *much*, be, for that reason, excused if he do *nothing*? "But," says one, "what good can I do by signing the pledge? I never drink, even without signing." This question has already been asked and even answered more than millions of times. Let it be answered once more.

For the man to suddenly, or in any other way, to break off from the use of drams, who has indulged in them for a long course of years, and until his appetite for them has become ten or a hundred fold stronger, and more craving, than any natural appetite can be, requires a most powerful moral effort. In such an undertaking, he needs every moral support and influence, that can possibly be brought to his aid, and thrown around him. And not only so, but every moral prop, should be taken *from* whatever argument might rise in his mind to lure him to his backsliding. When he casts his eyes around him he should be able to see all that he respects, all that he admires, and all that he loves, kindly and anxiously pointing him onward; and none beckoning him back, to his former miserable “wallowing in the mire.”

But it is said by some, that men will *think* and *act* for themselves; that none will disuse spirits or anything else merely because his neighbors do; and that *moral influence* is not that powerful engine contended for. Let us examine this. Let me ask the man who could maintain this position most stiffly, what compensation he will accept to go to

church some Sunday and sit during the sermon with his wife's bonnet upon his head? Not a trifle, I'll venture. And why not? There would be nothing irreligious in it; nothing immoral, nothing uncomfortable. Then why not? Is it not because there would be something egregiously unfashionable in it? Then it is the influence of *fashion*; and what is the influence of fashion, but the influence that *other* people's actions have on our own actions — the strong inclination each of us feels to do as we see all our neighbors do? Nor is the influence of fashion confined to any particular thing or class of things. It is just as strong on one subject as another. Let us make it as unfashionable to withhold our names from the temperance pledge as for husbands to wear their wives bonnets to church, and instances will be just as rare in the one case as the other.

"But," say some, "we are no drunkards; and we shall not acknowledge ourselves such by joining a reformed drunkards' society, whatever our influence might be." Surely no Christian will adhere to this objection. If they believe, as they profess, that Omnipotence condescended to take on Himself the

form of sinful man and, as such, to die an ignominious death for their sakes, surely they will not refuse submission to the infinitely lesser condescension for the temporal and perhaps eternal salvation of a large, erring, and unfortunate class of their own fellow creatures. Nor is the condescension very great.

In my judgment, such of us as have never fallen victims have been spared more from the absence of appetite, than from any mental or moral superiority over those who have. Indeed, I believe if we take habitual drunkards as a class, their heads and their hearts will bear an advantageous comparison with those of any other class. There seems ever to have been a proneness in the brilliant and warm-blooded to fall into this vice. The demon of intemperance ever seems to have delighted in sucking the blood of genius and of generosity. What one of us but can call to mind some dear relative, more promising in youth than all his fellows, who has fallen a sacrifice to his rapacity? He ever seems to have gone forth, like the Egyptian angel of death, commissioned to slay if not the first, the fairest born of every family. Shall

he now be arrested in his desolating career? In that arrest, all can give aid that will; and who shall be excused that *can* and will not? Far around as human breath has ever blown, he keeps our fathers, our brothers, our sons, and our friends, prostrate in the chains of moral death. To all the living everywhere, we cry, "Come sound the moral resurrection trump, that these may rise and stand up an exceeding great army"—"Come from the four winds, O breath! and breathe upon these slain, that they may live."

If the relative grandeur of revolutions shall be estimated by the great amount of human misery they alleviate, and the small amount they inflict, then, indeed, will this be the grandest the world shall ever have seen. Of our political revolution of '76 we all are justly proud. It has given us a degree of political freedom, far exceeding that of any other of the nations of the earth. In it the world has found a solution of the long mooted problem as to the capability of man to govern himself. In it was the germ which has vegetated, and still is to grow and expand into the universal liberty of mankind.

But with all these glorious results, past,

present, and to come, it has its evils too. It breathed forth famine, swam in blood, and rode on fire; and long, long after, the orphans cry and the widows wail continued to break the sad silence that ensued. These were the price, the inevitable price, paid for the blessings it bought.

Turn now, to the temperance revolution, in *it* we shall find a stronger bondage broken, a viler slavery manumitted, a greater tyrant deposed. In *it* more of want supplied, more disease healed, more sorrow assuaged. By *it* no orphans starving, no widows weeping. By *it* none wounded in feeling, none injured in interest. Even the dram-maker, and dram-seller, will have glided into other occupations *so* gradually as never to have felt the shock of change, and will stand ready to join all others in the universal song of gladness.

And what a noble ally this, to the cause of political freedom. With such an aid, its march cannot fail to be on and on, till every son of earth shall drink in rich fruition, the sorrow-quenching draughts of perfect liberty. Happy day, when, all appetites controlled, all passions subdued, all matter subjected, *mind* all conquering *mind* shall live

and move the monarch of the world. Glorious consummation! Hail fall of Fury! Reign of Reason, all hail!

And when the victory shall be complete—when there shall be neither a slave nor a drunkard on the earth—how proud the title of that *Land*, which may truly claim to be the birthplace and the cradle of both those revolutions, that shall have ended in that victory. How nobly distinguished that People who shall have planted, and nurtured to maturity, both the political and moral freedom of their species.

This is the one hundred and tenth anniversary of the birthday of Washington. We are met to celebrate this day. Washington is the mightiest name of earth—*long since* mightiest in the cause of civil liberty, *still* mightiest in moral reformation. On that name an eulogy is expected. It cannot be. To add brightness to the sun, or glory to the name of Washington, is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce the name, and in its naked deathless splendor leave it shining on.

The above is an *exact* copy as published in the Sangamo Journal, Springfield, Ill., March 26, 1842.

FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Fellow-Citizens of the United States:

In compliance with a custom as old as the Government itself, I appear before you to address you briefly and to take in your presence the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the United States to be taken by the President "before he enters on the execution of his office."

I do not consider it necessary at present for me to discuss those matters of administration about which there is no special anxiety or excitement.

Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States that by the accession of a Republican Administration their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed and been open to their inspection. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of those speeches when I declare that—

I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so.

Those who nominated and elected me did so with the full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations and had never recanted them; and more than this, they placed in the platform for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves and to me, the clear and emphatic resolution which I now read:

Resolved, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the rights of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

I now reiterate these sentiments, and in doing so I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible that the property, peace, and security of no section are to be in any wise endangered by the now incoming Administration. I add, too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitu-

tution and the laws, can be given will be cheerfully given to all the States when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause—as cheerfully to one section as to another.

There is much controversy about the delivering up of fugitives from service or labor. The clause I now read is as plainly written in the Constitution as any other of its provisions:

No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.

It is scarcely questioned that this provision was intended by those who made it for the reclaiming of what we call fugitive slaves; and the intention of the lawgiver is the law. All members of Congress swear their support to the whole Constitution—to this provision as much as to any other. To the proposition, then, that slaves whose cases come within the terms of this clause “shall be delivered up” their oaths are unanimous. Now, if they would make the effort in good temper, could they not with equal unanimity

frame and pass a law by means of which to keep good that unanimous oath?

There is some difference of opinion whether this clause should be enforced by national or by State authority, but surely that difference is not a very material one. If the slave is to be surrendered, it can be of but little consequence to him or to others by which authority it is done. And should anyone in any case be content that his oath shall go unkept on a merely unsubstantial controversy as to *how* it shall be kept?

Again: In any law upon this subject ought not all the safeguards of liberty known in civilized and humane jurisprudence to be introduced, so that a free man be not in any case surrendered as a slave? And might it not be well at the same time to provide by law for the enforcement of that clause in the Constitution which guarantees that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States"?

I take the official oath to-day with no mental reservations and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws by any hyper-

critical rules; and while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to and abide by all those acts which stand unrepealed than to violate any of them trusting to find impunity in having them held to be unconstitutional.

It is seventy-two years since the first inauguration of a President under our National Constitution. During that period fifteen different and greatly distinguished citizens have in succession administered the executive branch of the Government. They have conducted it through many perils, and generally with great success. Yet, with all this scope of precedent, I now enter upon the same task for the brief constitutional term of four years under great and peculiar difficulty. A disruption of the Federal Union, heretofore only menaced, is now formidably attempted.

I hold that in contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is im-

plied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our National Constitution, and the Union will endure forever, it being impossible to destroy it except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

Again: If the United States be not a government proper, but an association of States in the nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade by less than all the parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it—break it, so to speak—but does it not require all to lawfully rescind it?

Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that in legal contemplation the Union is perpetual confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed, in fact, by the Articles of Association in 1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776.

It was further matured, and the faith of all the then thirteen States expressly plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the Articles of Confederation in 1778. And finally, in 1787, one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution was "*to form a more perfect Union.*"

But if destruction of the Union by one or by a part only of the States be lawfully possible, the Union is *less* perfect than before the Constitution, having lost the vital element of perpetuity.

It follows from these views that no State upon its own mere motion can lawfully get out of the Union; that *resolves* and *ordinances* to that effect are legally void, and that acts of violence within any State or States against the authority of the United States are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

I therefore consider that in view of the Constitution and the laws the Union is unbroken, and to the extent of my ability I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. Do-

ing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part, and I shall perform it so far as practicable unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means or in some authoritative manner direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it *will* constitutionally defend and maintain itself.

In doing this there needs to be no bloodshed or violence, and there shall be none unless it be forced upon the national authority. The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the Government and to collect the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere. Where hostility to the United States in any interior locality shall be so great and universal as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the Federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people for that object. While the strict legal right may exist in the

Government to enforce the exercise of these offices, the attempt to do so would be so irritating and so nearly impracticable withal that I deem it better to forego for the time the uses of such offices.

The mails, unless repelled, will continue to be furnished in all parts of the Union. So far as possible the people everywhere shall have that sense of perfect security which is most favorable to calm thought and reflection. The course here indicated will be followed unless current events and experience shall show a modification or change to be proper, and in every case and exigency my best discretion will be exercised, according to circumstances actually existing and with a view and a hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections.

That there are persons in one section or another who seek to destroy the Union at all events and are glad of any pretext to do it I will neither affirm nor deny; but if there be such, I need address no word to them. To those, however, who really love the Union may I not speak?

Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its benefits, its memories, and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly from have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to are greater than all the real ones you fly from, will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake?

All profess to be content in the Union if all constitutional rights can be maintained. Is it true, then, that any right plainly written in the Constitution has been denied? I think not. Happily, the human mind is so constituted that no party can reach to the audacity of doing this. Think, if you can, of a single instance in which a plainly written provision of the Constitution has ever been denied. If by the mere force of numbers a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might in a moral point of view justify revolution; certainly would if such right were a vital one. But such is not our case. All the vital

rights of minorities and of individuals are so plainly assured to them by affirmations and negations, guaranties and prohibitions, in the Constitution that controversies never arise concerning them. But no organic law can ever be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in practical administration. No foresight can anticipate nor any document of reasonable length contain express provisions for all possible questions. Shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by national or by State authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. *May* Congress prohibit slavery in the Territories? The Constitution does not expressly say. *Must* Congress protect slavery in the Territories? The Constitution does not expressly say.

From questions of this class spring all our constitutional controversies, and we divide upon them into majorities and minorities. If the minority will not acquiesce, the majority must, or the Government must cease. There is no other alternative, for continuing the Government is acquiescence on one side

or the other. If a minority in such case will secede rather than acquiesce, they make a precedent which in turn will divide and ruin them, for a minority of their own will secede from them whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such minority. For instance, why may not any portion of a new confederacy a year or two hence arbitrarily secede again, precisely as portions of the present Union now claim to secede from it? All who cherish disunion sentiments are now being educated to the exact temper of doing this.

Is there such perfect identity of interests among the States to compose a new union as to produce harmony only and prevent renewed secession?

Plainly the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy. A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does of necessity fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible. The rule of a minority,

as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left.

I do not forget the position assumed by some that constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court, nor do I deny that such decisions must be binding in any case upon the parties to a suit as to the object of that suit, while they are also entitled to very high respect and consideration in all parallel cases by all other departments of the Government. And while it is obviously possible that such decision may be erroneous in any given case, still the evil effect following it, being limited to that particular case, with the chance that it may be overruled and never become a precedent for other cases, can better be borne than could the evils of a different practice. At the same time, the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions the people will have ceased to

be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal. Nor is there in this view any assault upon the court or the judges. It is a duty from which they may not shrink to decide cases properly brought before them, and it is no fault of theirs if others seek to turn their decisions to political purposes.

One section of our country believes slavery is *right* and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is *wrong* and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute. The fugitive-slave clause of the Constitution and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave trade are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law can ever be in a community where the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself. The great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This, I think, can not be perfectly cured, and it would be worse in both cases *after* the separation of the sections than before. The foreign slave trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately revived without restriction in

one section, while fugitive slaves, now only partially surrendered, would not be surrendered at all by the other.

Physically speaking, we can not separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced and go out of the presence and beyond the reach of each other, but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face, and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. Is it possible, then, to make that intercourse more advantageous or more satisfactory *after* separation than *before*? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions, as to terms of intercourse, are again upon you.

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing

Government, they can exercise their *constitutional* right of amending it or their *revolutionary* right to dismember or overthrow it. I cannot be ignorant of the fact that many worthy and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the National Constitution amended. While I make no recommendation of amendments, I fully recognize the rightful authority of the people over the whole subject, to be exercised in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument itself; and I should, under existing circumstances, favor rather than oppose a fair opportunity being afforded the people to act upon it. I will venture to add that to me the convention mode seems preferable, in that it allows amendments to originate with the people themselves, instead of only permitting them to take or reject propositions originated by others, not especially chosen for the purpose, and which might not be precisely such as they would wish to either accept or refuse. I understand a proposed amendment to the Constitution—which amendment, however, I have not seen—has passed Congress, to the effect that the Federal Government shall never interfere with the domestic institu-

tions of the States, including that of persons held to service. To avoid misconstruction of what I have said, I depart from my purpose not to speak of particular amendments so far as to say that, holding such a provision to now be implied constitutional law, I have no objection to its being made express and irrevocable.

The Chief Magistrate derives all his authority from the people, and they have conferred none upon him to fix terms for the separation of the States. The people themselves can do this also if they choose, but the Executive as such has nothing to do with it. His duty is to administer the present Government as it came to his hands and to transmit it unimpaired by him to his successor.

Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world? In our present differences, is either party without faith of being in the right? If the Almighty Ruler of Nations, with His eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North, or on yours of the South that truth and that justice will surely prevail by

the judgment of this great tribunal of the American people.

By the frame of the Government under which we live this same people have wisely given their public servants but little power for mischief, and have with equal wisdom provided for the return of that little to their own hands at very short intervals. While the people retain their virtue and vigilance no Administration by any extreme of wickedness or folly can very seriously injure the Government in the short space of four years.

My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and *well* upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to *hurry* any of you in hot haste to a step which you would never take *deliberately*, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and, on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it; while the new Administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied hold the right side in the dispute,

there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land are still competent to adjust in the best way all our present difficulty.

In *your* hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, and not in *mine*, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail *you*. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. *You* have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the Government, while *I* shall have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect, and defend it."

I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

March 4, 1861.

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN: At this second appearing to take the oath of the Presidential office there is less occasion for an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement somewhat in detail of a course to be pursued seemed fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of four years, during which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase of the great contest which still absorbs the attention and engrosses the energies of the nation, little that is new could be presented. The progress of our arms, upon which all else chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as to myself, and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard to it is ventured.

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil war. All dreaded it, all sought to avert it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from

this place, devoted altogether to *saving* the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to *destroy* it without war—seeking to dissolve the Union and divide effects by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war, but one of them would *make* war rather than let the nation survive, and the other would *accept* war rather than let it perish, and the war came.

One-eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was somehow the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union even by war, while the Government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the *cause* of the conflict might cease with or even before the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier

triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces, but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered. That of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses; for it must needs be that offenses come, but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh." If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speed-

ily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

March 4, 1865.

PROCLAMATION.

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas on the 22nd day of September, A. D. 1862, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following to-wit:

That on the 1st day of January, A. D. 1863, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.

That the Executive will, on the 1st day of January aforesaid, by proclamation, designate the States and parts of States, if any, in which people thereof, respectively, shall then be in rebellion against the United States; and the fact that any State or the people thereof shall on that day be in good faith represented in the Congress of the United States by members chosen thereto at elections wherein a majority of the qualified voters of such States shall have participated shall, in the absence of strong countervailing testimony, be deemed conclusive evidence that such State and the people thereof are not then in rebellion against the United States.

Now, therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln,

President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States in time of actual armed rebellion against the authority and Government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this 1st day of January, A. D. 1863, and in accordance with my purpose so to do, publicly proclaimed for the full period of one hundred days from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein the people thereof, respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States the following, to-wit:

Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana (except the parishes of St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, St. John, St. Charles, St. James, Ascension, Assumption, Terrebonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St. Martin, and Orleans, including the city of New Orleans), Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia (except the forty-eight counties designated as West Virginia, and also the coun-

ties of Berkeley, Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth City, York, Princess Anne, and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth), and which excepted parts are for the present left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued.

And by virtue of the power and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States and parts of States are and henceforward shall be free, and that the executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defense; and I recommend to them that in all cases when allowed they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known that such persons of suitable condition will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places and to man vessels of all sorts in said service.

And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington,
this 1st day of January, A. D. 1863,
(seal.) and of the Independence of the
United States of America the eighty-
seventh.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

By the President:

William H. Seward, *Secretary of State.*

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS.

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation, so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We are met to dedicate a portion of it as the final resting place of those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated

it far above our power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work that they have thus far so nobly carried on. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us,—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion,—that we here highly resolve that the dead shall not have died in vain; that the nation shall, under God, have a new birth of freedom, and that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

The above is the standard and authentic text made four days after its delivery, by Mr. Lincoln, to be placed with records of the Gettysburg Cemetery Association.

Best Temperance Literature

Lincoln: The Man of Sorrow. By Eugene W. Chafin, 100 pp., cloth, postpaid	\$ 50
Alcohol in Society. By Richard Eddy, D. D., cloth, 400 pp., postpaid	1 00
Century of Drink Reform in U. S. By A. F. Fehlandt, 410 pp. postpaid	1 00
Fillmore's Prohibition Songs. Cloth, 224 pp. postpaid . . .	35
Prohibition Year Book 1908, 200 pp., paper	25
" " " " cloth	50
Prohibition, Principle and Policy, paper, postpaid	25
" " " " cloth, 227 pp., postpaid . . .	75
Prohibition Songs of Victory. Paper, 42 pp., postpaid . . .	15
Saloon Keepers Ledger. By L. A. Banks, D. D., cloth, 129 pp., Postpaid	75
The People, vs., The Liquor Traffic. By John B. Finch, paper cover, 472 pp., postpaid	25
Temperance Bible Commentary. By F. R. Lees, Ph. D., 490 pp., postpaid	1 25
Wealth and Waste. By Prof. A. A. Hopkins, cloth, 274 pp., postpaid	1 00
Cyclopedia of Prohibition. Cloth, 670 pp., postpaid . . .	2 25
Life of Colonel John Sobieski. Cloth, 384 pp., postpaid . .	1 50

Lincoln Temperance Press

92 La Salle Street

CHICAGO, ILL.

JUN 27 1908

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 837 592 0

